Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/715,384	BALTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732	

All Participants:

(1) *Mathieu D. Vargot*.

(2) *Mr. Cohn (Atty)*.

Status of Application: *Allowed*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *6 January 2005*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
That of record

Claims discussed:
17

Prior art documents discussed:
That applied

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Added aspects of testing and selecting the tire as means language in apparatus claim 17 to place same in conformance with method claim 1, these claims being considered distinct from post cure inflation for reasons noted by applicant.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

M. Vargot
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)